A U M

It would not be without advantage to examine these things, slight indeed in appearance, but which are often the secret springs of the most important events.—TACITUS.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXX | October, 1942 | No. 12

CLEAR SEEING

IMPEDIMENTS to clear thinking are more difficult to remove than obstacles to physical sight, for the reason that the material obstacle is recognized for what it is. Take, for example, the occasional prejudice against reincarnation that one meets in discussing Theosophy. Objectors to reincarnation—who, incidentally, are fewer than is sometimes supposed—never assume rebirth as a law of nature, and then examine the consequences of the position taken. Rather, reincarnation is opposed with arguments founded on the implicit belief that there is but one life, followed by extinction or by some vaguely conceived kind of immortality. Such arguments are not the expression of an impartial mind, but of a mind that is determined to think according to accustomed patterns and will accept no idea that might require some change.

While the prospect of an impartial discussion of reincarnation with any bigoted mind may seem out of the question, it is nonetheless true that something of the bigotry of a Calvin, for instance, exists in all human nature. The more or less obvious reasons why some men will not listen to the Theosophical propositions are the same reasons that dispose others to disagree with less force and less bitterness. Materialistic disbelief in the existence of soul, derived from Haeckel more than from any other one man, is usually the reason why the typical scientist or admirer of science will not give reincarnation a fair hearing. He condemns it *a priori*. So also with the fundamentalist in religion and the believer in materialistic doctrines of social reform.

In the case of one whose intellectual and emotional life, in its impersonal aspects, has been devoted to the spread of revolutionary theory, there is a confirmed habit of condemning a certain "class"—the capitalists. He reacts to the teaching that in his next life, he, the agitator may be born a captain of industry, and the capitalist

as a wage slave, with instinctive distrust. If this be true, then the revolutionary doctrine is false; "but the revolutionary doctrine *cannot* be false, because it is my life work; therefore, the theory of reincarnation is false."

So reasons, or rationalizes, the apostle of violent reform, and his objection is common also to many so-called "liberals" who have come to mistake the material benefits of a redistribution of wealth for "the good society" itself. It is not that these earnest men find reincarnation unreasonable; it is that they have not *reasoned* about it at all. So much of their *feeling* resources have been invested in a contrary view of life and human nature that it is literally beyond them to contemplate a doctrine that would make their past look like a waste of time and energy.

This sort of analysis helps to explain why so few of the "leaders" of society, the men who determine policies and form public opinion, manifest an interest in the teachings of Theosophy. Theosophy is truly revolutionary, in its first principles, in the developed implications of those principles, and strong characters who have given much of themselves to other views are unable to rise to the sacrifice of their past.

It is also illustrative of cyclic law, from both the individual and the group point of view, that the exoteric leaders of men adopt and stand by beliefs that represent the orthodoxies of the epoch. As individuals, they have brought forward to this birth the mental deposits and Karmic momentum of former lives. The more intense their beliefs, the more devoted their efforts in carrying out their work, the less immediate opportunity for open-minded consideration of a philosophy of soul. There are undoubtedly many strong and noble souls working through the pattern of an orthodoxy in which their Karma has placed them, and their single-minded loyalty to that work is itself a veil to the larger truths of life. From the national or racial point of view, the law of cyclic evolution imposes its restrictions: "idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even free-thinkers, are but the outcome and the natural product of their respective environments and periods. The ideals of both are only the necessary results of their temperaments, and the outcome of that phase of intellectual progress to which a nation, in its collectivity, has attained." Thus exoteric leaders are usually *typical* of the progress of the race; they are the human reference-points that govern the thought of millions of the "follower" class.

It is only when old patterns begin to reveal their inadequacies that large numbers of people enter the territory of doubt. In personal life,

this sometimes comes in the brooding hours of failure, though it is really a time of karmic fulfillment, when the sediment of former thinking is sifted away, when hope dies, and the search for *knowledge* may be resumed. What really happens is that the man's devotional feeling is withdrawn from his old belief, and, for the first time, he sees his own thought and action without the bias of desire. Then the scepticism of a lifetime may vanish, the objectives sought for years seem no more valuable than tinselled toys of childhood. Momentarily, the knot of the heart has been untied; the soul, so long forced to spend its energies through the limited paths of human misconception, awakes, and feels its freedom. A seeker with the "light of heaven" in his eyes is born, and, simply and humbly, he undertakes his quest.

No few inquirers into Theosophy seem to be "shaken" men and women, persons who have been through the fire of deep sufferings and trial. But a shaken man may have been shaken back to his inward foundations, and the apparent weakness is only of the personality, not of the soul.

The whole world is today being shaken by the throes of its own moral struggle, borne on by the common Karma of the race to a relative destruction, to a failure already manifest and bitter in its fulfillment. But there will be those who, finding the false superstructures of personal life unstable, are shaken back to the foundations of the ego within, and come to look about them with the deep, seeing eyes of suffering overcome. With them the agony will not have been in vain, and their strength not too long in its returning.

The Falls of Man

Always remember thou art a man, that human nature is frail, and that thou mayest easily fall,—and thou shalt never fall. But if, happening to forget what thou art, thou chancest to fall, be not discouraged; remember that thou mayest rise again; that it is in thy power to break the bonds which join thee to thine offence, and to subdue the obstacles which hinder thee from walking in the paths of virtue.

—Confucius..

THOUGHTS ON KARMA AND REINCARNATION

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

"In man there are arteries, thin as a hair split a 1,000 times, filled with fluids blue, red, green, yellow, etc. The tenuous involucrum (the base or ethereal frame of the astral body) is lodged in them, and the ideal residues of the experiences of the former embodiments (or incarnations) adhere to the said tenuous involucrum, and *accompany it in its passage from body to body.*" —*Upanishads.*

"JUDGE of a man by his questions rather than by his answers," teaches the wily Voltaire. The advice stops half-way in our case. To become complete and cover the whole ground, we have to add, "ascertain the motive which prompts the questioner." A man may offer a query from a sincere impulse to learn and to know. Another person will ask eternal questions, with no better motive than a desire of cavilling and proving his adversary in the wrong.

Not a few among the "inquirers into Theosophy," as they introduce themselves, belong to this latter category. We have found in it Materialists and Spiritualists, Agnostics and Christians. Some of them, though rarely, are "open to conviction"—as they say; others, thinking with Cicero that no liberal, truth-seeking man should ever impute a charge of unsteadiness to anyone for having changed his opinions—become *really* converted and join our ranks. But there are those also—and these form the majority—who, while representing themselves as *inquirers,* are in truth *carpers.* Whether owing to narrowness of mind or foolhardiness they intrench themselves behind their own preconceived and not unseldom shallow beliefs and opinions, and will not budge from them. Such a "seeker" is hopeless, as his desire to investigate the truth is a pretext, not even a fearless mask, but simply a *false nose.* He has neither the open determination of an avowed materialist, nor the serene coolness of a "Sir Oracle." But—

"You may as well
Forbid the sea for to obey the moon,
As, or by oath remove, or counsel shake,
The fabric of his folly . . . "

Therefore, a "seeker after truth" of this kind had better be severely left alone. He is intractable, because he is either a skin-deep sciolist, a self-opinionated theorist or a fool. As a general rule,

---

NOTE.—This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for April, 1889.

he talks reincarnation before he has even learnt the difference between *metempsychosis,* which is the transmigration of a human Soul into an animal form, and Reincarnation, or the rebirth of the same Ego in successive human bodies. Ignorant of the *true* meaning of the Greek word, he does not even suspect how absurd, in philosophy, is this purely exoteric doctrine of transmigrations into animals. Useless to tell him that Nature, propelled by Karma, never recedes, but strives ever forward in her work on the physical plane; that she may lodge a human soul in the body of a man, morally ten times lower than any animal, but she will not reverse the order of her kingdoms; and while leading the irrational monad of a beast of a higher order into the human form at the first hour of a Manvantara, she will not guide that Ego, once it has become a man, even of the lowest kind, back into the animal species—not during that cycle (or Kalpa) at any rate.*

The list of queer "investigators" is by no means exhausted with these amiable *seekers.* There are two other classes—Christians and Spiritualists, the latter being in some respects more formidable than any. The former having been born and bred believers in the Bible and supernatural "miracles" on *authority,* or "thirty-seventh hand evidence," to use a popular proverb, are often forced to yield in the face of the first hand testimony of their own reason and senses; and then they are amenable to reason and conviction. They had formed *à priori* opinions and got crystallized in them as a fly in a piece of amber. But that amber has cracked, and, as one of the signs of the times, they have bethought themselves of a somewhat tardy still sincere search, to either justify their early opinions, or else part company with them for good. Having found out that *their* religion—like that of the great majority of their fellow men—had been founded on *human* not *divine* respect, they come to us as they would to surgical operators, believing that theosophists can remove all the old cobwebs from their bewildered brains. Sometimes it does so happen; once made to see the fallacy of first accepting and identifying themselves with any form of belief, and then only seeking, years later, for reasons to justify it, they very naturally try to avoid falling again into the same mistake. They had once to content themselves with

*Occult Science teaches that the same order of evolution for man and animals—from the first to the seventh planet of a chain, and from the first to the end of the seventh round—takes place on every *chain* of worlds in our Solar system from the inferior to the superior. Thus the highest as the lowest Ego, from the monads selected to people a new chain in a Manvantara, when passing from an inferior to a superior "chain" has, of course, to pass through every animal (and even vegetable) form. But once started on its cycle of births no human Ego will become that of an animal during any period of the seven rounds.—*Vide* SECRET DOCTRINE.

such interpretations of their time-honoured dogmas as the fallacy and often the absurdity of the latter would afford; but now, they seek to learn and understand before they believe.

This is the right and purely theosophical state of mind, and is quite consistent with the precept of Lord Buddha, who taught never to believe merely on authority but to test the latter by means of our personal reason and highest intuition. It is only such seekers after the eternal truth who can profit by the lessons of old Eastern Wisdom.

It is our duty, therefore, to help them to defend their new ideals by furnishing them with the most adequate and far-reaching weapons. For they will have to encounter, not only Materialists and Spiritualists, but also to break a lance with their ex-coreligionists. These will bring to bear upon them the whole of their arsenal, composed of the pop-guns of biblical casuistry and interpretations based on the dead-letter texts and the disingenuous translation of *pseudo* revelation. They have to be prepared. They will be told, for instance, that there is not a word in the Bible which would warrant belief in reincarnation, or life, more than once, on this earth. Biologists and physiologists will laugh at such a theory, and assure them that it is opposed by the fact that no man has a glimpse of recollection of any *past* life. Shallow metaphysicians, and supporters of the easy-going Church ethics of this age, will gravely maintain the injustice there would be in a posterior punishment, in the present life, for deeds committed in a previous existence of which we know nothing. All such objections are disposed of and shown fallacious to anyone who studies seriously the esoteric sciences.

But what shall we say of our ferocious opponents, the Kardecists, or the reincarnationists of the French school, and the *anti*-reincarnationists, *i.e.*, most of the Spiritualists of the old school. The fact, that the first believe in rebirth, but in their own crude, unphilosophical way, makes our task the more heavy. They have made up their minds that a man dies, and his "spirit," after a few visits of consolation to the mortals he left behind him, may reincarnate at his own sweet will, in whom and whenever he likes. The Devachanic period of no less than a 1,000, generally 1,500 years, is a vexation of mind and a snare in their sight. They will have nothing of this. No more will the Spiritualists. These object on the highly philosophical ground that "it is *simply impossible*." Why? Because it is so unpalatable to most of them, especially to those who know themselves to be the personal Avatar, or the reincarnation of some historically great hero or heroine who flourished within the last few centuries (rebirth from, or into, the scums of Whitechapel, being for them out of

question). And "it is so cruel," you see, to tell fond parents that the fancy that a *still-born* child, a daughter of theirs, who, they imagine, having been reared in a nursery of Summerland, has now grown up and comes to visit them daily in the family séance-room, is an absurd belief, whether reincarnation be true or not. We must not *hurt their feelings* by insisting that every child who dies before the age of reason—when only it becomes a responsible creature—reincarnates immediately after its death—since, having had no personal merit or demerit in any of its actions, it can have no claim upon Devachanic reward and bliss. Also that as it is irresponsible till the age of, say, seven, the full weight of the Karmic effects generated during its short life falls directly upon those who reared and guided it. They will hear of no such philosophical truths, based on eternal justice and Karmic action. "You hurt our best, our most devotional feelings. Avaunt!" they cry, "we will not accept your teachings."

E pur se muove! Such arguments remind one of the curious objections to, and denial of, the sphericity of the earth used by some clever Church Fathers of old. "How can the earth, forsooth, be round?" argued the saintly wiseacres—the "venerable Bedes" and the Manichean Augustines. "Were it so the men *below* would have to walk with their heads downward, like flies on a ceiling. Worse than all, they could not see the Lord descending in his glory on the day of the second advent!" As these very logical arguments appeared irrefutable, in the early centuries of our era, to Christians, so the profoundly philosophical objections of our friends the *Summerland* theorists, appear as plausible in this century of Neo-Theosophy.

And what are your proofs that such series of lives ever take place, or that there is reincarnation at all?—we are asked. We reply (1): the testimony of every seer, sage and prophet, throughout an endless succession of human cycles; (2) a mass of *inferential* evidence appealing even to the profane. True, this kind of evidence—although not seldom men are hung on no better than such *inferential* testimony—is not absolutely reliable. For, as Locke says: "To infer is nothing but by virtue of one proposition, laid down as true, to draw in another as true." Yet, all depends on the nature and strength of that first proposition. The Predestinarians may lay down as true their doctrine of Predestination;—that pleasant belief that every human being is pre-assigned by the will of our "Merciful Father in Heaven," to either everlasting Hell-fire, or the "Golden Harp," on the pinion-playing principle. The proposition from which this curious

belief is inferred and laid down as true, is based, in the present case, on no better foundation than one of the nightmares of Calvin, who had many. But the fact, that his followers count millions of men, does not entitle either the theory of total depravity, or that of predestination, to be called a universal belief. They are still limited to a small portion of mankind, and were never heard of before the day of the French Reformer.

These are pessimistic doctrines born of despair, beliefs artificially engrafted on human nature, and which, therefore, cannot hold good. But who taught mankind about soul transmigration? Belief in successive rebirths of the human *Ego* throughout the cycles of life in various bodies is a universal belief, a certainty innate in mankind. Even now, when theological dogmas of human origin have stifled and well-nigh destroyed this natural inborn idea from the Christian mind, even now hundreds of the most eminent Western philosophers, authors, artists, poets and deep thinkers still firmly believe in reincarnation. In the words of Georges Sand, we are:—

> "Cast into this life, as it were into an alembic, where, after a previous existence which we have forgotten, we are condemned to be remade, renewed, tempered by suffering, by strife, by passion, by doubt, by disease, by death. All these evils we endure for our good, for our purification, and so to speak, to make us perfect. From age to age, from race to race, we accomplish a tardy progress, tardy but certain, an advance of which, in spite of all the sceptics say, the proofs are manifest. If all the imperfections of our being and all the woes of our estate drive at discouraging and terrifying us, on the other hand, all the more noble faculties, which have been bestowed on us that we might seek after perfection, do make for our salvation, and deliver us from fear, misery, and even death. Yea, a divine instinct that always grows in light and in strength helps us to comprehend that nothing in the whole world wholly dies, and that we only vanish from the things that lie about us in our earthly life, to reappear among conditions more favourable to our eternal growth in good."

Writes Professor Francis Bowen, as quoted in *"Reincarnation,* a study in Forgotten Truths"*—uttering a great truth:—

> "The doctrine of metempsychosis may almost claim to be a natural or innate belief in the human mind, if we may judge from its wide diffusion among the nations of the Earth and its prevalence throughout the historical ages."

---

*We advise every disbeliever in reincarnation, in search of proofs, to read this excellent volume by Mr. E. D. Walker. It is the most complete collection of proofs and evidences from all the ages that was ever published.

The millions of India, Egypt, China, that have passed away, and the millions of those who believe in reincarnation to-day—are almost countless. The Jews had the same doctrine; moreover, whether one prays to a *personal,* or worships in silence an impersonal deity or a Principle and a Law, it is far more reverential to believe in this doctrine than not. One belief makes us think of "God" or "Law" as a synonym of Justice, giving to poor little man more than one chance for righteous living and for the atoning of sins whether of omission or commission. Our disbelief, credits the Unseen Power instead of equity with fiendish cruelty. It makes of *it* a kind of a sidereal Jack the Ripper or Nero doubled with a human monster. If a *heathen* doctrine honours the Deity and a Christian dishonours it, which should be accepted? And why should one who prefers the former be held as—an *infidel?*

But the world moves on now as it has always moved, and along with it move the ideas in the heads of the fogies. The question is not whether a fact in nature fits, or not, some special hobby, but whether it is really *a fact* based on, at least, inferential evidence. We are told by those special *hobbyists* that it is not. We reply, study the questions you would reject, and try to understand our philosophy, before you dismiss our teachings *à priori.* Spiritualists complain, and with very good reasons, of men of science who, like Huxley, denounce wholesale their phenomena whilst knowing next to nothing of them. Why do they do likewise, with regard to propositions based on the psychological experiences of thousands of generations of seers and adepts? Do they know anything of the laws of Karma—the great Law of Retribution, that mysterious, yet—in its effects—quite evident and palpable action in Nature, which, sooner or later, brings back every good or bad deed of ours to rebound on us, as the elastic ball, thrown against a wall, rebounds back on the one who throws it? They do not. They believe in a personal God, whom they endow with intelligence, and who rewards and punishes, in their ideas, every action of ours in life. They accept this *hybrid* deity (finite, because they endow it most unphilosophically with conditioned attributes, while insisting on calling it Infinite and Absolute), regardless of, and blind to, the thousand and one fallacies and contradictions in which the theological teachings concerning that deity involve us. But when offered a consistent, philosophical and quite logical substitute for such an imperfect God, a complete solution of most of the insoluble problems and mysteries in human life—they turn away in idiotic horror. They remain indifferent or opposed to

it, only because its name is KARMA instead of Jehovah; and that it is a tenet which emanates from Aryan philosophy—the deepest and profoundest of all the world philosophies—instead of from the Semitic cunning and intellectual jugglery, which has transformed an astronomical symbol into the "one living God of Gods." "We do not want an *impersonal* Deity," they tell us; "a negative symbol such as 'Non-Being' is incomprehensible to Being." Just so. "The light shineth in darkness; but the darkness comprehendeth it not." Therefore they will talk very glibly of their *immortal* spirits; and on the same principle that they call a personal God *infinite* and make of him a gigantic *male,* so they will address a human phantom as "Spirit"—Colonel Cicero Treacle, or "Spirit" Mrs. Amanda Jellybag, with a vague idea that both are at least sempiternal.

It is useless, therefore to try and convince such minds. If they are unable or unwilling to study even the broad general idea contained in the term *Karma,* how can they comprehend the fine distinctions involved in the doctrine of reincarnation, although, as shown by our venerable brother, P. Iyaloo Naidu of Hyderabad, Karma and Reincarnation are, "in reality, the A B C of the Wisdom-Religion." It is very clearly expressed in the January *Theosophist,* "Karma is the sum total of our acts, both in the present life and in the preceding births." After stating that Karma is of three kinds, he continues:—

> "*Sanchita Karma* includes human merits and demerits accumulated in the preceding births. That portion of the *Sanchita Karma* destined to influence human life . . . in the present incarnation is called Prarabdham. The third kind of Karma is the result of the merits or demerits of our present acts. *Agami* extends over all your words, thoughts, and deeds. What you think, what you speak, what you do, as well as whatever results your thoughts, words, and acts produce on yourself, and on those affected by them, fall under the category of the present Karma, which will be sure to sway the balance of your life for good or for evil in your future development (or reincarnation)."

Karma thus, is simply *action,* a concatenation of *causes and effects.* That which adjusts each effect to its direct cause; that which guides invisibly and as unerringly these effects to choose, as the field of their operation, the *right person in the right place,* is what we call *Karmic law.* What is it? Shall we call it the hand of Providence? We cannot do so, especially in Christian lands, because the term has been connected with, and interpreted theologically as, the *foresight*

and *personal design* of a personal god; and because in the active laws of Karma—*absolute Equity*—based on the Universal Harmony, there is neither foresight nor desire; and because again, it is our own actions, thoughts, and deeds which *guide that law,* instead of being guided by it. "Whatever a man soweth, that shall he reap." It is only a very unphilosophical and illogical theology which can speak in one breath of *free will,* and grace or damnation being *pre-ordained* to every human *from* (?) eternity, as though eternity could have a beginning *to start from!* But this question would lead us too far into metaphysical disquisitions. Suffice it to say that Karma leads us to rebirth, and that rebirth generates new Karma while working off the old, *Sanchita* Karma. Both are indissolubly bound up, one in the other. Let us get rid of *Karma,* if we would get rid of the miseries of rebirths or—Reincarnation.

To show how the belief in REINCARNATION is gaining ground even among the un-intuitional Western writers, we quote the following extracts from an Anglo-Indian daily.

METEMPSYCHOSIS

"Dissatisfaction with the results of missionary enterprise in India is the most prominent feature of cultivated Christian sentiment in these days, and it must force attention both to the mistake of assailing Hinduism with the mock-culture of cram . . . and to the intellectual weakness of many of the benevolent persons entrusted with the operation. The mistake has already been painfully illustrated in the incidents of the Madras Christian College disturbance, and it is not difficult to find an illustration of the attendant misfortune. In a missionary production of some pretensions an attempt is seriously made to confute the theory of the 'Transmigration of Souls,' which betrays an incapacity for metaphysical presentments and an ignorance of psychology that are unfortunate in any person undertaking such a task. Yet this effusion finds admission into a recognized missionary organ, and will perhaps be regarded by young missionaries as a triumphant display of intellectual strength to be coveted for the present and, if possible, imitated afterwards. And people wonder in the face of this sort of thing that the subtle Hindu mind laughs at Christian assaults on its stronghold! The arguments put forward in the paper referred to are worth looking into one by one.

"The first is that metempsychosis 'disregards the evidence of memory.' Proof of this presumption is, of course, not attempted. It so happens that psychologists from Plato downward have called attention to the familiar mental phenomenon in which persons placed,

for the first time in their lives, in peculiar circumstances, are suddenly invaded by the conviction that they have gone through the same experience before. Most big schoolboys remember the explanation that this phenomenon may be attributable to the reduplicative property of consciousness resulting from the double lobing of the brain. But even such boys can hardly forget that the phenomenon has also been regarded as evidence of a pre-existent state; and reflecting men must see that one hypothesis is as moral, as reasonable, and as scientific as the other. It may, indeed, be said that the latter hypothesis finds better corroboration than the former in the moral analogies of our nature. There is nothing inconsistent with the highest philosophical teaching, or with the moral lessons or the actual experience of Christ; in the occlusions of memory Christ himself, even in adult manhood, under the stress of physical entanglements, sometimes entirely forgot his pre-existent state, and, what is more to the point, some of its radically inseparable convictions, such as that He had 'seen the Father,' and 'dwelt in the bosom of the Father,' and held communion with Him 'before the foundation of the world,' and had 'come down from heaven,' and should 'lose nothing.' On any other supposition some of Christ's most forcible sayings, and especially some of his most earnest prayers, would be unmeaning. If Christ then, because of his temporary incarnation in human nature, sometimes became so oblivious of His antecedent conditions—of His inseparable oneness with God, with its ineradicable accompaniments and its predestined results—as to be able earnestly to cry out 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' and 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from me:' things which *neither could be nor were truly desired by himself*—why may not any other human nature, not inlaid with an essential divinity, forget for longer or shorter periods its state of pre-existence, if it had one? Is it contended that such infirmity, unattainable by fallible man, was possible only to the infallible Son of God? Once admit the possibility of occlusion of memory, and the duration of the interval and even its character become matters of detail. Theologians may attribute to immaturity of intelligence that apparent unconsciousness of infants, which a keener insight may recognise as the inevitable hiatus between distinct conditions of a human consciousness. The babe being as perfectly human as any man—and indeed being, according to Christ, in the highest natural moral condition of humanity—the theory of a temporary occlusion of memory is not less philosophical, nor is it less moral, than the theory of undeveloped consciousness. No doubt the rank and file of religious teachers, perhaps because they have been so taught and fear

to think for themselves, have decided on teaching differently. But this may only show that the rank and file of religious teachers are incapable of balancing philosophical equations and are not qualified for their great office. May it not also account for the melancholy fate of the religion taught by them in its conflict with Hinduism?

"It is gravely urged that 'spirit exists *only* as it acts or suffers in feeling, thinking, willing. Spirit in any other sense is a meaningless abstraction.' If this means that while spirit exists anywhere its experience must be registered somewhere, it is superfluous platitude. If it means either that temporary unconsciousness, in whole or in part, is an impossibility, or that every spirit must in every moment of its existence be fully conscious of all experiences registered in every other moment of its existence, it assumes what is contradicted in the daily experience of all human beings but idiots. Admit the possibility of a hiatus, and its width and depth are mere questions of degree.

"The second argument is that metempsychosis involves a 'libel on divine justice.' The alleged belief of the Hindus, that suffering in one state of being expiates sin in another, which is not essentially unjust, nor a whit less moral than the dogma of inherited or imported sin, may or may not be unfounded; but the first question is—is the atonement of Christ incompatible with transmigration? If so, why? A single scripture text in support of this unwarranted assumption would be useful, for if transmigration is not inconsistent with the atonement of Christ, it is a waste of time trying to find out how or why it disagrees with any self-constituted religious teacher's ideas of divine justice. It is easy for omniscient sages to settle definitely what divine justice ought to be. . . . For any unprepossessed mind there is certainly much in the Christian scriptures which is compatible with, and nothing that contradicts, the doctrine of a preexistent state. In what conceivable way can the theory of a man's being a fallen spirit or a risen animal, or both, conflict with what Christ actually said? When, for instance, a group, who evidently believed in a former state of existence, actually asked him (John IX., 2 and 3) whether a particular man was 'born blind' because of his own sin or that of his parents, he answered, *not* that they were harbouring a mischievous delusion—which was what he did in an unmistakable way when men in difficulty sincerely submitted real delusions to his scrutiny—but that they were mistaken in their opinion in the particular case. His teaching here may be fairly claimed, not merely as not being antagonistic to, but as being in harmony with, and even lending colour to, the transmigration of souls. If religious teachers choose to decide that Christ knew less about 'divine justice' than they, the issue must be left to awakening Christendom.

"The third argument is that metempsychosis 'is contrary to all sound psychology.' Nine out of ten of the religious teachers who glibly dogmatise in this fashion are such indifferent psychologists that they have no intelligent conception even of the scripture teaching—leave alone any more abstruse presentments—on the differing spheres of body, soul and spirit in the three-fold nature of man,* and would be sorely puzzled to explain in what way many of the higher human responsibilities are adjusted between their own psychic and pneumatic natures; and also what becomes of the unity of individual responsibility in the face of this tri-partite allotment. And yet such persons are put up to grapple with pantheistic Brahmans on the mysteries of Vedantism! The first step in comparative psychology is to show in a reasonable way that Christian psychology (as taught by its former and immediate disciples, and not as excogitated by low-pitched ecclesiastical afterthought) is unfavourable to metempsychosis. This step has not been taken. The difficulty of taking it seems insuperable, and bland assumption of its ease can only be regarded as the audacity of ignorance.

"The fourth argument against transmigration is that it 'is opposed to sound ethics.' This is another of those almost comical assumptions cheerfully made by self-sufficient men, who begin by regarding themselves as the oracles of God and sole repositories of his mind, and naturally end by treating all they feel inclined to say as inspired; but for which, it is well to remember, there is no particle of authority in scripture, and no particle of proof anywhere else. All that any system of sound ethics can demand surely is that personal responsibility shall be attached to every intelligent exercise of individual will. How any conflict with this condition or any of its logical inferences can arise from the necessity for a future state of existence, it is obviously incumbent on those to point out who fling forth arbitrary assertions right and left. Every thinking man must be aware of a growth in his own moral consciousness by which a gulf has intervened between his present and his past: while his personality has survived to identify him, he is aware of distinct stages in his moral nature to which very different degrees of responsibility attach. How does this fact militate against sound ethics? Wherein, moreover, does the innocence of the ignorant child, who retains individual identity while sustaining differing burdens of responsibility, involve any danger to sound ethics? In what sense, in which such innocence does not also do so, can a pre-existent state, of all whose burdens of

*The Christian scripture really teaches a *four-fold* nature in man—speaking of the natural body, the spiritual body, the soul, and the spirit. It is so far in close accordance with ancient Oriental ideas on the subject.

responsibility a human mind may not be uniformly or continuously conscious in that region of understanding in which impression and expression constantly re-act on each other, 'annihilate the distinction between virtue and vice, right and wrong'? Any mind not determined to retain foregone conclusions must perceive that the words quoted are solemn nonsense. It is hardly a whit more silly to maintain that any hypothesis of the evolution of the photosphere must 'annihilate time and space.' The difficulty of disproving either statement of course arises from the utter absence of any connexion between premise and conclusion.

"The fifth contention against metempsychosis is that 'it is not in accord with science.' Religious teachers are for the most part so imperfectly equipped in science that it is amusing to find any of them stepping out of the region of confused and confusing theology, in which detection is not always sure, into the domain of science, where exposure is certain, to lay down the law as from the 'unanswerable pulpit.' Only a generation ago Darwin tickled the scientific world and convulsed the religious by inventing 'natural selection,' by which animals passed on their types, so to speak, to the next of kin. No assumption of recent years partakes more of the character of a metaphysical delusion; nor perhaps does any other scientific fad conflict more with Bible doctrine that every animal and every tree is self-contained, having 'its seed in itself.' Every true physiologist ought to understand this profound truth and its striking confirmation in scientific analogies which cannot be explained here. Nevertheless nearly all the prophets—all but a thinking few—employed what wit the theory of Darwin left them in reconciling their religious sense (it cannot be called a religious conscience) to the unproved hypothesis, apparently for no better reason than that it was greatly affected by clever infidels. But what is there in science that negatives the idea, if it can be sustained by evidence of a natural selection by which if there be any soul at all, the individual soul of a lower organism may pass by stages into higher organism? Science, of course, refuses to accept anything unproved, and from this point of view a religious man's begetting another in the spiritual hope, or the spirit of God causing a man to be born from above, are out of the range of physical science equally with the incarnation of Christ. But if such a thing as a physical life independently of a body, or a spiritual life independently of a soul, can exist at all, it is not more unscientific to imagine the soul of a monkey passing at some time after death into some higher type of animal, than it is to imagine either a spiritual birth on the one hand or a mutation of species on the other."—(Allahabad *Pioneer.*)

NAMARUPA

CHIEF among the blind spots in the race mind is, perhaps, the confusion of terms with things, and names with people—a mental skandha that has been designated by theosophists in the Orient, *namarupa*. Psychologists go to great lengths to prove that "redness" is nothing of itself—there are only *red things*. Such a distinction is no doubt vital, but at this stage of mental or intellectual evolution, it would perhaps be even more valuable to focus on the fact that, for instance, "idealism" is nothing of itself—there are only idealists. Further, that there are idealists and idealists. Time spent in drawing such a line would not be wasted, for we should realize, then, that although some minds have certain definite characteristics in common, no two men carry exactly the same mental stock. Those who seek not sophism, but *sophia,* wisdom, are those who define terms carefully, and guard against the unsophisticated use of words.

Classifying types of men by general terms is an important aid in identifying or indicating habits of thought. The use of a commonly-accepted "handle" saves needless repetition of detail; but when carried to the extreme, when a name or a term becomes a literal Procrustean bed to which individual thinkers are fitted,—then classification becomes an excuse for vague thinking, if not a form of condemnation. To call a man a rationalist, for example, may mean that he holds a certain philosophical position, or it may be understood to prove him to be a rational thinker, or, again, it may be thought of as necessarily elevating or degrading his mental status. Which is simply to say that our understanding of words is to be traced to the attitude of mind with which we hear them. There are magic phrases for the lower mind that have a blinding fascination, just as there are magic phrases for the higher mind that fire the intuition.

The student of Theosophy may be regarded as a realist, idealist, scientist, religionist, or philosopher, all or none, depending entirely on the definition of terms.

If realism is looking at one-half of the facts, the dark half, say, or the lower half, if it is pessimism or materialism,—

If idealism is vague speculation, theorizing on unstable fundamentals, thinking divorced from action,—

If science is dealing exclusively with effects, premising untested hypotheses, reading man as an animal,—

If religion is belief as distinct from knowledge, speculation displacing truth, dogma substituted for eternal doctrine,—

If philosophy is talking not living, arguing not agreeing, multiplying abstractions and reducing certitudes,—

Then the theosophist is not of their numbers.

If, on the other hand, realism is dealing with actual problems in terms of proven verities, and with a consciousness of man's responsibility for his fate,—

If idealism is the knowledge of the Real world as the basis and cause of the phenomenal, the realization that ideas and ideals are the vital forces behind the world and all peopling it,—

If science is work with facts and laws of universal wisdom, constant search for wider application of eternal verities, and an attempt to synthesize the universe into a complete and consistent whole,—

If religion is the ensouling faith that brotherhood is a fact in nature, the unifying bond of devotion to the common weal,—

If philosophy is man's guide in choice of daily conduct, man's protection through storms of pain and passion, and man's hope of immortality and perfect wisdom,—

Then, the theosophist is at once the student and devotee of all these systems.

Many things divide men one from the other,—aims, purposes, methods, beliefs, training, experience, knowledge. It is not necessary to add to that number namarupas, "stumbling blocks in words." The differences in human beings are all alike expressions of one common law of living progress, one common order of vital evolution. We may also look for unity under the various titles assumed by men: the true man belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all.

To pronounce a word is to evoke a thought, and make it present: the magnetic potency of the human speech is the commencement of every manifestation in the Occult World. To utter a Name is not only to define a Being (an Entity), but to place it under and condemn it through the emission of the Word (Verbum), to the influence of one or more Occult potencies. Things are, for every one of us, that which it (the Word) makes them while naming them. The Word (Verbum) or the speech of every man is, quite unconsciously to himself, a BLESSING or a CURSE; this is why our present ignorance about the properties or attributes of the IDEA as well as about the attributes and properties of MATTER, is often fatal to us. —P. CHRISTIAN.

SELF-EXAMINATION

"WHEREIN have I offended?" Here, in a few words, is the first principle of self-examination. The theosophist learns to apply to his own conduct universal principles; and then to see in the world about him a reflection of his inner and most private life. For instance, the theosophist knows that he is capable of acting as the slave of his passions and also, though perhaps rarely, with the self-control of a sage. So, he judges, must it be with nations. How many times could it not be asked, with benefit, each nation of itself: "Wherein has *our side* offended, that it should call forth the envy, greed, and savage hate of our opponents?" A great and wise man says this on behalf of the nation, and thus averts war. Mayhap, at the time, no one was aware that divine history was then written.

One is stirred by such a glimpse into the springs of history as that in Laurence Housman's play "Victoria Regina": Prince Albert is made to say:

> And when he dies, they will say of this man—"Oh, yes; he had his faults; but he always upheld the Honour of his country." And when they say "Honour" they mean Pride. Again and again he has been ready to sacrifice the Honour of his country to its Pride. For Honour means that you are too proud to do wrong; but Pride means that you will not own that you have done wrong—at all.

"A man's enemies are those of his own house," said the prophet of old. A nation's enemy, who gives (or takes) offense, is not "extra-territorial": he is *within that nation.* And just as each individual has a teacher from whom he learns, not what is wrong with the other fellow, but what is right and wrong action for himself; so also each nation has its great sages to point out divine truth to its men. For example, one of China's great teachers, Mencius, brought this message:

> If a man love others and that love is not returned, let him examine himself as to his love for others. If he rules others, but his government is not successful, let him examine himself as to his wisdom. If he is polite to others but they impolite to him, let him examine himself as to his real respect for them. When by what we do we do not achieve our aim, we must examine ourselves at every point.

Admonitions of Confucius also illustrate the universal need for self-judgment:

> To assail one's own wickedness and not assail that of others, is not this the way to correct cherished evil?

> In archery we have something like the way of the superior man. When the archer misses the center of the target, he turns around and seeks the cause of his failure within himself.
>
> Now there is no end of the things by which man is affected; and when his likings and dislikings are not subject to regulation (from within), he is changed into the nature of things as they come before him; that is, he stifles the voice of the Heavenly principle within, and gives the utmost indulgence to the desires by which men may be possessed.
>
> In this we have the rebellious and deceitful heart, with licentious and violent disorder.

And what of that "treacherous and villainous people" we call "the enemy"? Is it a nation of criminals? We may recognize great national tendencies for evil gaining the upper hand in a nation, but we also must admit that no nation is free from fault. Suppose, for instance, we see greed, arrogance, and vengeful pride swaying some national policy in the Orient today. Can we not also see the quality of *tamas* elsewhere in the East—lazy indifference, love of comfort and consequent corruption? And the Anglo-Saxon—how much has he taught his Asiatic brother of the ruthlessness *he* practiced in pursuing his own advantage at the expense of others; of his worship of Mars; of his pursuit of Empire? Have we been generous and benevolent, or have we perhaps been moved by the quality of *rajas?* We are, or we prefer to think we are, mild-tempered today. Will that pay for past crimes?

To do even justice, let us listen to a spokesman for the other side, though his is a voice from beyond the grave: The average Westerner, said Okakura-Kakuzo (1862-1913)

> was wont to regard Japan as barbarous while she indulged in the gentle arts of Peace; he calls her civilized since she began to commit wholesale slaughter on Manchurian battlefields. Much comment has been given lately on the code of Samurai,—the Art of Death which makes our soldiers exult in self-sacrifice; but scarcely any attention has been drawn to Teaism, which represents so much our Art of Life. Fain would we remain barbarians if our claim to civilization were to be based on the gruesome glory of war. Fain would we await the time when due respect shall be paid to our art and our ideals.
>
> When will the West . . . try to understand the East? . . . Indian spirituality has been derided as ignorance, Chinese sobriety as stupidity, Japanese patriotism as the result of fatalism. It has been said that we are less sensible to pain and wounds on account of the callousness of our nervous organization! . . . .

> Asiatic youths are flocking to Western colleges . . . . They evince our willingness to approach the West on our knees. Unfortunately the Western attitude is unfavorable to the understanding of the East. The Christian missionary goes to impart, not to receive. . . . It is rarely that the chivalrous pen of a Lafcadio Hearn or that of the author of *The Web of Indian Life* enlivens the oriental darkness with the torch of our sentiments.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> When we consider how small after all the cup of human enjoyment is, how soon overflowed with tears, how easily drained to the dregs in our quenchless thirst for infinity, we shall not blame ourselves for making so much of the tea cup. Mankind has done worse. In the worship of Bacchus, we have sacrificed too freely; . . . Why not consecrate ourselves to the queen of the Camelias and revel in the warm stream of human sympathy that flows from her altar? In the liquid amber within the ivory-porcelain, the initiated may touch the sweet reticence of Confucius, the piquancy of Laotse, and the ethereal aroma of Sakyamuni (the Buddha) himself.

In these days of "licentious and violent disorder" may we not remember that nations are like individuals whose mood, motive and temper change with the days, the years, the generations? May we not hold fast to the faith that evil done today is not forever irreparable? We have sinned, and will again, no doubt. We do not know how much our offenses have incited the innocent to the present desperate outbreak. But our work as individuals must be to teach the coming generations, *by example,* not to hate, that they may not become involved in future wars.

THE UNSPOKEN "SERMON"

Every life is a profession of faith, and exercises an inevitable and silent propaganda. As far as lies in its power, it tends to transform the universe and humanity into its own image. Thus we have all a cure of souls. Every man is the center of perpetual radiation like a luminous body; he is, as it were, a beacon which entices a ship upon the rocks if it does not guide it into port. Every man is a priest, even involuntarily; his conduct is an unspoken sermon, which is forever preaching to others; but there are priests of Baal, of Moloch, and of all the false gods. Such is the high importance of example. Thence comes the terrible responsibility which weighs upon us all.

—*Amiel's Journal.*

WRONG POPULAR NOTIONS

[It is difficult for those who think habitually in scientific terms to give impartial consideration to Theosophy, because of the dogmatism, unconscious for the most part, with which it is maintained that scientific assumptions are infallibly correct. In this article, which Wm. Q. Judge published in the *Path* for November, 1894, the speculative character of many so-called "facts" of science is pointed out, in contrast with the philosophical views of the ancients, as presented by Theosophy. Study of "Wrong Popular Notions" should be helpful to students in fitting themselves to discuss both Theosophy and scientific beliefs with those who place undue faith in the latter.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

"WHAT are your proofs?" is often asked of the Theosophical student who believes in reincarnation and Karma, who holds to the existence of the astral body, and who thinks that evolution demands a place in the cosmos for Mahatmas (or great souls) as facts and ideals. "If you cannot prove reincarnation just as you would a fact in a court of law, I will not believe," says one, while another says, "Make such objective demonstrations as science does, and then you may expect me to agree with you." But in truth all these objectors accept as proven in the way they demand for Theosophy many things which on a slight examination are seen to rest as much on theory and metaphysical argument as do any of the doctrines found in Theosophical literature. The axioms of mathematics are unprovable; the very word assumes that they have to be accepted. Being accepted, we go forward and on the basis of their unproved truth demonstrate other and succedent matters. The theories of modern astronomy are taken as true because by their means eclipses are foretold and other great achievements of that science made possible. But many centuries ago quite different theories of the relations and motions and structure of the heavens allowed the old astronomers to make the same deductions. Let us examine a few words and things.

THE ATOM

The atom and the molecule are very influential words. They are constantly used by people claiming to follow science, but who indulge in criticisms on the uncertainties of Theosophical speculation. Yet no one ever saw an atom or a molecule. They are accepted as facts by

science—just as the spiritually-inclined accept the existence of the invisible soul—yet it is impossible to objectively prove either the one or the other. They are deemed to be proven because they are necessary. But let a Theosophist say that the astral body exists, and Mahatmas also, because both are necessary in evolution, and at once a demand arises for "demonstration" by objective proofs.

THE SUN

The sun is the apparent source of energy, and is confidently supposed by many to be a mass of burning material. No one, however, knows this to be so. No one was ever there, and the whole set of theories regarding the luminary rests on assumptions. Many natural facts are against some of the theories. The great fact that the higher the mountain the more cold it is on top would be one, not wholly accounted for by theories as to radiation. And when we remember the great, the immense, difference between the various scientific estimates of the sun's heat, doubt increases. Seeing that electricity is now so much better known, and that it is apparently all-pervading, the ancient idea that the sun is a center of electrical or magnetic energy which turns into heat as well as other things on reaching here, becomes plausible and throws some spice of illusion into the doctrine that our sun is a mass of burning matter.

Again, the sun is seen as if over the horizon in full view every clear evening, when in fact he has been some minutes down below the line of sight. Refraction partly accounts for this, but none the less is his apparent visibility or position above the horizon an illusion.

THE STARS

Many of those that are known as fixed stars are immeasurably far away. Sirius is at an immense distance, and has been receding always many thousands of miles each minute. Others are so far off that it takes one hundred thousand years for their light to reach here.

Yet since records began they have all remained apparently in one place and in the same relation to each other. They constitute a vast illusion. They are moving and yet they remain still. We point the telescope at one of our sister planets, and knowing that its light takes fifteen minutes or more to get to us, we must be continually directing the glass to a point in space where the planet is not, and by no possibility can we point to where it actually is. Still, for all this uncertainty, many complicated and definite calculations are based on these observations of mere illusions.

Latitude and Longitude

These are practically used every hour of the day for the safeguarding of human life and property. But they exist only in the brains of men, for they are not in the sky or on land. They are theoretical divisions made by man, and they are possible only because the sole reality in nature is that which is jeered at by many as the ideal. But if the ancients are said to be the constructors of a great human chart in the Zodiac, the divisions of which have a bearing on the navigation of the great ocean of human evolution, the proud practical man says that you have but shown the ancients to be fanciful, superstitious, grotesque. But they were not so. Doubtless the saying recorded of Jesus about the time when we should see "the sign of the Son of Man in the heavens" will not so far from now be found to have a practical meaning in human life.

The ancient Sage was like the modern captain. The captain takes an observation of the illusionary stars and the blazing sun, thus discovering whether his ship is near or far from land. The Sage observed the Zodiac, and from the manner it and its boats were related to each other he was able to calculate whether the human freight in the boat of human evolution was near a rock or on the free, open sea in its eternal and momentous journey.

Sensation of Touch

Everyone is accustomed to say that he has touched this or that object on which his fingers may have rested. But this is not so. We do not touch anything; we only perceive and report a sensation which we call touch. If that sensation is due to actual contact between the skin and the object, then the harder we pressed, and thus the nearer we came to the object's surface, the more accurate should be the sensation. In fact, however, if we press hard we dull the sensation and turn it into one of pain for the skin. There is always a space between the skin and the surface dealt with, just as there is always a space between the molecules of each mass. If two smooth planes be pushed on to each other they will adhere, and the smoother they are the more difficult it will be to get them apart. If we could actually touch the hand to any surface so as to cover all of it with a touching surface, we could not withdraw the hand at all. All that we get, then, by what we call touch is the idea produced by the vibration and by that much of contact as is possible in the case.

CONTINUOUS SOLIDITY

Quite Theosophical is the scientist when he says that "we cannot know anything of the actual nature of matter in itself, but can only know the sensation or the phenomena." The mineral or metal called even the hardest is not solid or continuous in itself. This is now admitted by all scientific men. Even the diamond, "hardest of all," is a mass of moving molecules made up of like moving atoms. Its hardness is only relative. It is simply harder than glass because its atoms are moving at a more rapid rate. In a recent lecture in London Mr. Bell, a scientific light, told how the edge or point of the diamond cuts the glass because the molecules in the diamond move more rapidly and get in between the slower ones of the glass and thus cut it. And so it is with all other masses of matter. They are only masses of molecules in different rates of vibration; none of them solid or hard save in a relative sense. Is it not true, then, as so often held by philosophers and so insisted on by those Adepts who gave us information through H. P. Blavatsky that the world we are in is to be properly considered in a metaphysical sense and not as a mere mechanism that can be explained on mechanical principles? And in the face of all the illusions and all the speculations of life and science, why should the Theosophists be asked to make or give any different sort of proofs than those availed of by science in all its investigations? There is no reason. —WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

SPIRITUAL "THEORY"

Theory points the way, and urges toward the world of fact. Without her guidance all would be inexplicable . . . the Divinity would never emerge from the courts of pure intellectuality to display his presence in the distant confines of space and in the flitting moments of time. In Eternity and on the unseen spaces of ideal form, absorbed in his own being, rayless, and remote from human ken, would He dwell—occasional shadows but transiently telling of his existence, and these too evanescent and dubious to be identified and seen. . . .

Theory, say what we will, is after all the very life of Truth. It is Truth freed from the mists of sense. It is Truth unveiled in her very features to human eyes. . . . Theory is a prevision of the future. It is the ark in which are safely placed the precious lives of those truths that are to float unhurt over the destructive deluge of past errors, and destined to repeople the renovated earth with pure forms and free institutions. —BRONSON ALCOTT.

AMONG YOUTH-COMPANIONS

"WHAT makes a leader?" Gail asked the question after a thoughtful silence during which the members of the discussion group had sat considering the suggestion of King, the chairman, that they decide on their weekly problem subject.

No one spoke for a minute, and Gail went on. "Where would we draw the line between the leader and the above-average intelligent citizen? What are the qualifications of a leader?"

"Well, we may start by saying that to lead you have to be in front," volunteered Max. "In front, that is, of your age, your associates or contemporaries."

"Then the question becomes, why are you ahead of your time?" Alayne put in quickly.

"You could have invented something," Janice took it up. "The television set, or the airplane, for instance. Or you might have made a discovery—a re-discovery, I mean," she corrected herself.

There was a pause, and Martinez spoke: "Then you would certainly be a leader in science," he said to Janice. "But what about other fields—religion, philosophy, education, or reform in general?"

"It isn't education that makes a leader," declared Gail in her sudden way. "Many of our greatest leaders here in America have had little formal schooling. Lincoln attended school for less than a year, altogether, you know."

"And it isn't training either," Alayne chimed in excitedly. "I read the other day that Thomas Paine never learned the art of writing, and was in middle age when he picked up the 'pen of the Revolution'!"

"The same with Jefferson and Washington, you might add," said Dave, speaking for the first time. "Where did Jefferson get the philosophy of natural rights, instead of divine rights, contained in the *Declaration of Independence?* And what gave Washington his great knowledge of military science and his amazing ability to handle his army?"

"History books tell that they rose to the occasion and showed extraordinary powers, but there is no explanation of how or why," said King.

"Yes, and why is it that some people will devote their lives to a particular reform, such as abolition of slavery, women's rights, treatment of the insane? Whatever possessed a William Lloyd Garrison, a Susan B. Anthony, or a Dorothea Dix?" wondered Max out loud.

"When I took the course on Leaders at school the teacher asked us on the exam to discuss some major episodes in American history according to the influence of the leader on the event, and the influence of the event on the leader," contributed Gail.

"She must have been trying to find out whether you believed that events make the man or the man makes the events," laughed Janice. "What did you answer?"

"Why, I discussed the events from both angles, only I was careful to put in 'latent power' and 'inherent ability,' so it would not look as if I thought environment was the whole story," replied Gail, flashing a smile at the group. "By the way, there was another part to my question. But maybe that's answered, now."

"Let's have it anyway," urged Janice. "It might be something we hadn't thought of."

"Well, it certainly was something I hadn't thought of," returned Gail. "I always considered that leaders, like other beings, were the same in kind and differed only in degree of intelligence. But toward the end of the course the instructor suggested dividing leaders into two classes; those who were 'unique,' or who had powers that their fellows did not have, and those who were merely the prime expression of a forward trend of their age."

"I don't quite get the distinction," said Max in the silence that followed. There was a chorus of "Neither do I," and then laughter.

"To tell you the truth," said Gail when they were serious again, "I didn't exactly see what she meant either, at first. I pondered over it a bit and the other day I hit upon an analogy which distinguished them for me: Those who embody a progressive movement are merely riding the crest of the wave, as we say, while the others, the 'unique,' are the seagulls soaring above."

"You mean the seagull, granting it self-consciousness for the moment, can see the relative position of any particular wave to the general movement of the ocean itself," said King. "It has a vision of the future and a knowledge of the past, while the crest of the wave is only slightly higher than the wave itself. In that case, a lot would depend on how high the gull flew, wouldn't it?"

"Which leaders would you put in each class?" interposed Dave.

"I'd put leaders like Garrison and Susan B. Anthony on the crest of the wave and cast the others we mentioned, Washington, Lincoln, and Paine, for example, in the role of 'seagulls'," replied Gail.

"It seems to me you are back to your original idea of difference in degree only," said King, his eyes twinkling.

"Perhaps I am," Gail acknowledged, a little "crest" fallen.

"Let's see what difference there would be if such a course were given in a Theosophical university," Dave suggested.

There was busy thinking for a while, then Janice spoke: "Theosophy would define the true leader and explain his rise, as Mr. Judge does in the *Echoes*. He says there that the Elder Brothers have left their mark on many pages of history and influence the world daily."

"That means that They were behind these leaders or reformers, then, doesn't it? Encouraging them and helping their movements?" asked Martinez.

"They certainly support 'all those who are engaged in the true service of Humanity,' " said King, emphasizing the "true." "Some leaders are illuminated by a ray of Higher Manas, as was Paine when he saw the vision of the America of the future," he went on. "But the still greater leaders are those in whom Higher Manas is ever active, Mr. Judge tells us. In short, the 'minor currents' in the 'Ocean,' modified and directed by the Masters, are only understood when seen as part of the all-inclusive Theosophical Movement."

"You asked in the beginning, Gail, what was the difference between a leader and an above-average citizen," said Max then. "That suggests another point—what about our responsibility as citizens to 'leaders'? Should we be just followers?"

"I should say not!" exclaimed Alayne. "Gracious, what an idea!"

"Now, now, 'Miss America,' control yourself," said Dave, coolly, "or that 'independence' will get you in trouble some day. We are all followers in some situations, and leaders in others. Don't let's let mere *names* confuse us. Nobody is suggesting we give up our sense of responsibility, our personal conscience, or our convictions. We have to work with others and for others all the time, whether we realize it or not. But that does not mean that we follow another's method blindly. Every man makes his own way, cuts his own path. The true leader is there so we won't get 'lost in the woods' of side issues. Isn't the best 'follower' the one who knows how to lead and is self-reliant, just as a 'leader' must first learn to follow?"

"It would seem that we should not try to be leaders or followers *as such,* but combine the best elements of both," offered King. "We are responsible for *leading* our own life the best we can, each according to his lights,—the method is for us to choose. And we *follow,* not other men or their paths, but The Path all great men have pointed to and striven to embody. In the work we have on hand the unity is derived from the end all have in view, but each must fit himself, by self-devised means, to be 'the better able' to work for others, and to contribute the best presently possible to him."

THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION

'Tis the fine souls who serve us, and not what is called fine society.

. . . the first lesson of history is the good of evil. Good is a good doctor, but Bad is sometimes better. —EMERSON.

THE "economic interpretation" did not start with the political philosopher of the nineteenth century, who applied it to history; the economic interpretation is but another name for that view of life which is primarily concerned with, not causes, but conditions. It is as old as man's lapse of memory (or consciousness) of his self-appointed Divine Mission. It dates from the time man allowed his Purpose to be lost among purposes, his Aim to be confused with aims. Man lives to learn—to learn to teach. Nature hangs on *his* words, Evolution stays for *his* impulsion, his Brothers wait for *his* comradeship. But Man, blinded by false lights, looks blankly at these, his attendants, whom he misnames "conditions," and impatiently waits for *them*. "When obstacles are removed, I will continue," says he, disdainfully. "I cannot work under such conditions. My environment is restrictive, confining, and does not allow room for self-expression. I will do nothing yet." So Man fiddles while another Rome burns.

The economic interpretation decrees that things are either to be avoided or possessed. An exclusiveness of outlook is cultivated, by which a thing is either "good" or "bad," "right" or "wrong," "pleasant" or "unpleasant." By attributing qualities to mere quantities, we open the door to a host of misconceptions about "men, things and methods," because we render ourselves incapable of distinguishing between the man and his action, the method and the result.

Our habit of rationalization is another expression of the economic interpretation. We rack our brains in the attempt to identify temporary, provisional means with enduring ends; human, imperfect methods with humane aims; compromises with uncompromising Truth. We satisfy ourselves that what we want to do is right and best. "We do what we must and call it by the best names." We conveniently forget, somewhere along the line, that truth in application is not different from Truth in the abstract, that Practical Theosophy is not something apart from Theoretical Theosophy, any more than a man working is essentially different from the same man thinking. Although we know that the only "true" method is the method

of Truth, we are prone to argue that "ideal" tactics are not fitted to present-day affairs. What we fail to realize is that Truth's white ray, having been separated into colors by the prism of life on earth, is not forever and irretrievably broken and dissipated, but is, by the focus of Mind, recombined into purity. "Conditions" are never resolved by themselves, only by the Thinker.

There are those who speak of "new social and economic realities." As if, with human nature unchanged for ages, any *new* "realities" are conceivable! Does sunshine change because we learn more of its power? Do we add anything to the law of gravity by a fuller understanding of it? An English Professor and editor of what we unwittingly term a "liberal" Review recently wrote:

> Centralization of social authority, economic collectivism, expert administration, the trend toward international unification, are objective developments rooted in the scientific facts of our time. . . . Planning, centralization, positive government, aggressive leadership—none of these is the invention of the devil or the monopoly of the fascists. They are the results of the technological revolution through which we are passing; and their exercise is the fundamental condition of our survival.

Whether or not these tendencies *are* the invention of the devil may be left as an academic question, but they are at least as old as "His Satanic Majesty." What government of the immediate or remote past had not these characteristics in varying proportions, in its own individual mixture? Are the Inca government, the Catholic Church, Feudalism, and the Byzantine and Roman empires but "the snows of yesteryear," to be forgotten because no longer visible? Do we not betray political adolescence when we regard our governmental system and social trends as not merely *new,* but the only *true* realities?

Consider the inverse logic of another statement from the same professor: "People of no opportunities move toward the future in short stages; too often the next meal is the limit of their flights. But a human being is progressive: if his necessities are supplied, he begins to think of ideals." The cool suavity of this pronouncement need not blind us to its cloudy reasoning. It is in line with the common assumption of the social scientist that conditions, surroundings and environment are the real forces behind evolution, the actual determinants of Man, his powers, faculties, character and personality. The social *philosopher* points out that the circumference does not make the centre and its radii, that the outside is not the cause of the inside, or, to be precise, that Man is not the end-result of a haphazard, undirected, or blind Evolution, but is himself the source, cause and origin of the visible and invisible worlds and beings.

The professor's theory is presumably that ideals follow meals. But feed man as you would an animal, and what will his ideals be but more and more varied food? It is the nature of an appetite to be insatiable. Such is not progression, but retrogression—reversion to the personal, animal traits that bind mind to matter. *Progress can be attained, and only attained, by the development of the nobler qualities.* (*Key,* p. 235.) Social efforts, says H. P. B., should aim at the "ultimate social emancipation" of the poor, "or the development of the sense of duty in those who now so often neglect it in nearly every relation of life."

Those who see only half-truths, and "outside trimmings," persist in believing that the administration of charity is sufficient to produce self-reliant citizens with intelligent social consciences. This is belief, truly, as distinct from knowledge, for the history of social welfare *per se* is the record of *impractical* charity. Many are the slaves to "economic interpretations"—of themselves, the world and Life. Their emancipation is not to be accomplished by relieving them of the responsibility for their own life and living, but rather by heightening their sense of duty.

Instead of a stultifying concept of culture through comfort, the theosophical philosophy presents the law of balanced forces as the basic motion of life. When the Teacher said, "Woe to him who lives without suffering," did she mean to imply only the necessity for the instruction by suffering?

Instance Emerson's challenging statement:

> Wars, fires, plagues, break up immovable routine, clear the ground of rotten races and dens of distemper, and open a fair field to new men. There is a tendency in things to right themselves, and the war or revolution or bankruptcy that shatters a rotten system, allows things to take a new and natural order. The sharpest evils are bent into that periodicity which makes the errors of planets, and the fevers and distempers of men, self-limiting. Nature is upheld by antagonism. Passions, resistance, danger, are educators. We acquire the strength we have overcome. Without war, no soldier; without enemies, no hero. The sun were insipid, if the universe were not opaque. And the glory of character is in affronting the horrors of depravity, to draw thence new nobilities of power . . .

The "economic" interpretation is expensive—disastrously so, for it costs us ourselves. It compels submersion under the tides in the affairs of men. It requires a descent into the maelstrom of what we may call the "unattached present"—that present that is considered as unrelated to the "waves" of either past or future. What is current is deemed to have a unique veracity.

Their eternal curiosity about Tomorrow makes some men quiet workers for the state of spiritual interdependence, indefatigable toilers, dedicated to freeing Man's mind and heart from irresponsibility, or dependence on Authority. But in other men such speculation inspires efforts toward the *physical* interdependence which they cannot see will lead only to *organized* moral and mental slavery. The latter speak in terms of the Mass, in which men are but human atoms. The former say with the Sage of Concord, "Leave this hypocritical prating about the masses. Masses are rude, lame, unmade, pernicious in their demands and influence, and need not to be flattered but schooled. I wish not to concede anything to them, but to tame, drill, divide, and break them up, and *draw individuals out of them.*" (Italics ours.) If we employ the individualistic interpretation of history, the connection between the two statements quoted at the head of this article is clear, and social "evils" may be seen to "open a fair field to new men,"—that is, to arouse some few, *fine souls* to service.

Eternal Memory

At the moment of the great change that man calls death—that which we call "memory" seems to return to us in all its vigour and freshness. May this not be due as just said, simply to the fact that, for a few seconds at least, our two memories (or rather the two states, the highest and the lowest state, of consciousness) blend together, thus forming one, and that the dying being finds himself on a plane wherein there is neither past nor future, but all is one present? Memory, as we all know, is strongest with regard to its early associations, then when the future man is only a child, and more of a soul than of a body; and if memory is a part of our Soul, then, as Thackeray has somewhere said, it must be of necessity eternal. Scientists deny this; we, Theosophists, affirm that it is so. They have for what they hold but negative proofs; we have, to support us, innumerable facts. . . The links of the chain of cause and effect with relation to mind are, and must ever remain a *terra incognita* to the materialist. For if they have already acquired a deep conviction that as Pope says—

> "Lulled in the countless chambers of the brain
> Our thoughts are link'd by many a *hidden* chain . . . "

—and that they are still unable to discover these chains, how can they hope to unravel the mysteries of the higher, Spiritual, Mind!

—H. P. Blavatsky.

KAMA AND BUDDHI

THE *Secret Doctrine* suggests that before the enquiring student attempts to understand the specific teachings of the Theosophical philosophy, "he should be made acquainted with the few fundamental conceptions which underlie and pervade the entire system of thought to which his attention is invited." This admonition is a constant whenever the investigation of difficult subjects such as the various principles of man is undertaken. It applies as well to the older student who seeks to penetrate behind the terminology of philosophical expression to living meaning. The wise or conscientious workman or inventor, trying for the hundredth time to perfect his grasp of a certain process or his ability to apply a principle, inspects again both the principle and his tools. For the theosophist, the "Three Fundamentals" are both principles and tools. They cannot be taken for granted or assumed to be fully known because they have been expressed on different occasions with facility and in varying terms.

One who attempts to grasp the implications of teachings respecting the Kamic principle for himself is, even if not consciously, making a step in the application of the Three Fundamentals. The sincere desire to understand himself, his conflicting emotions and impulses, is a perception that some of these elements must be controlled and others nurtured in the interests of a larger whole to which he belongs. Here the interdependence based on the spiritual identity postulated by the First Fundamental becomes the essence of the Third—a duty to *beings* in evolution, and identifies itself also with the Second, the obligation to understand the processes or laws of nature which allow opportunities for learning to those same beings.

When self-consideration becomes conscious and specific the application of principles becomes more detailed. The implication of the first and third principles is that whatever is meant by the Kamic nature or principle in man, it is also a level of monadic life, reaching towards that higher manifestation of consciousness, the indwelling Manas, or *Mind-Soul*. Therefore, the forms of natural intelligence which manifest themselves as physical personal desires are in no way intrinsically "evil." When they are fully natural, as among the simple grades of ascending savagery, they are as "good" *on their own plane* as are the higher moral leanings of the Mind-Soul. In more advanced civilizations abuses and perversions of Kamic energy

work against the upward swing of evolution, but in this case the "evil" is not due to Kama—rather, to Manas.

The Soul as the dweller within, and the "soul" of the psychophysical organism both speak a direct language. The language of the former we call intuition; of the latter, instinct. The impersonal, spiritual man desires to serve, the personal man to be served. It is the fault of neither "soul" that their purposes conflict. Only through the clearing house of reason may the personal man raise his standards of appetite and habit until they no longer obstruct the other and higher purpose—living for and as the Self of all.

The above formula, that we have desires which need to be controlled for the benefit of all, is the discipline underlying every form of religious life. Unfortunately, this discipline of itself seldom tends toward the desired consummation. Ascetics who sought to free themselves from their lower vehicle by "rending flesh and muscle" became concentrated upon the very physical practices they were following. Both lower and higher self suffered. The "sin" concept and complex of Western Christianity produced the same result and still produces it wherever preserved. The doctrines of Theosophy present a contrasting view. The summation of all theosophical teaching in respect to man is that *nothing is ever destroyed.* Desires cannot be destroyed, because the essence of every desire is living intelligence. Desire can only be used, and it is through use, not through artificial suppression, that change in human nature is wrought.

From the standpoint of soul, racial evolution can be evaluated. Sex, for instance, is totally unnecessary—if we reason "abstractly." And yet if the conditions and laws of life *all* have their meaningful part in the design of learning, can it be said that the factor of sexual attractions and expression is evil or unnecessary? Both serve as media of learning, perhaps the only media which fits the *general* psychic development of the race-mind. Men may learn through their experiences with sex to know *in themselves* the noble from the ignoble, to learn the difference between a love of self-indulgence and a love that first desires to bring pleasure and then genuine service to the one loved.

Many definitions of Kama and Buddhi have been given. That Kama is Buddhi "upside down," as reflected in the material world, suffices to clarify the relation of instinct to intuition. Bearing in mind the ever-present phrase that "behind will stands desire," might it not also be said that Buddhi represents life or intelligence that has grown to the level of intuitive knowledge, while Kama represents the intelligence that *must* grow and be raised for evolution to proceed? Kama

is thus the "mystic seed of growth," for only in life energy that *can move,* either up or down, does creativity reside. The close relation between the creative powers of man, mental and physical, suggests this. Creative evolution must utilize Kama, for Kama is the element in flux, the element not yet stabilized. The occult problem which has proved too deep for conventional religions ever to solve is how to utilize the energy of Kama instead of drying it up at the source by ascribing its manifestations to devils and evil forces. Hindu mythology often made the deity of procreation King of the Gods, and the Eastern peoples have fared much better than the Western in respect to religiously generated eroticism.

Unless Kama be at least partially understood, one may live either the life of a libertine or a life of dullness, repression and stagnation. Either life is a life of unbalance. Therefore it is curiously, though understandably true, that the majority of the misinformed alternate from one extreme to the other, perhaps rapidly, and perhaps only from incarnation to incarnation. The occasional carnal eruptions of men and women psychically attracted to unreasonable ascetism have been the despair of the individuals concerned and of the churches as well. The nature of man instinctively fights to combat stagnation, and existence either remote from the world or too much in and of it produces unbearable dullness. Even the Kamic nature rebels if directed constantly towards the same forms of dissipation. Every atom of man's hierarchy of lives demands new channels of expression, and hence can be noted the occasional "total reform" of the roué as well as the sporadic sensual outbursts of the religious penitent.

Modern science, albeit through its most materialistic organ, Western psychology, has breathed a certain message of cheer to a neurotic world. The sin complex has been fought to its knees. An "evil self" in man has been denied, which is an improvement over old-time religion. But a "higher self" has also been refused a place. Kama is fairly well understood as "natural," but Buddhic intuition has been decreed unnatural. Therefore, in the life of the majority of moderns the Kamic instinct itself becomes unnatural and perverted: its own higher counterpart lies speechless, bound in fetters fashioned by the mind.

Humanity is a great Brotherhood by virtue of the sameness of the material from which it is formed physically and morally. Unless, however, it becomes a Brotherhood also intellectually, it is no better than a superior genus of animals. —H. P. B.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Our "Liquor-sodden Capital"

A *Christian Century* editorial of May 27 notes the "shocking" figures of liquor consumption in the District of Columbia, nearly twice that per person in Nevada, the "wettest" state. During 1940, "4.26 gallons of liquor were consumed for every man, woman and child in the federal district":

> Nevada . . . consumed only 2.65 gallons per person and stood second in the list. The per capita consumption in New York was 1.35 gallons, in Illinois 1.64. Worse than that, the consumption in the District of Columbia went up from 3.8 gallons in 1939 to the 4.26 of 1940—an increase of more than 12 per cent in per capita drinking in a single year. And reports from Washington indicate that the curve of liquor consumption is steadily rising. Statistics of this kind simply cannot be explained away. They indicate a concentration of liquor indulgence at the one place in the nation where clearest heads and steadiest nerves are today most needed. The war can be lost just as easily in the cocktail parties and jammed barrooms of Washington as in the waters of the south Pacific or the factories of Detroit. If the administration does not act to end this scandal of a liquor-sodden capital, it can justly be accused of indifference to an actual fifth column which is working night and day in the interests of national defeat.

Liquor Statistics

The *Magazine Digest* for February carries an article, "Is Prohibition Coming Back? from which the following figures are taken:

> According to the American Businessmen's Research Foundation, drinkers have dug out of their pockets for the legal purchase of liquor since repeal, $23,386,526,005 in cold cash. Illegal purchases bring the total to over 25 billion dollars.
>
> It costs the average family in the United States $26.22 per year for hard liquor. Drink bills for Pop, Mom and their grown-up sons and daughters, range from $12.52 to $35.37. . . . The Keeley Institute in Dwight, Illinois, reports that between 1933 and 1940, alcoholism among men and women has increased 42 per cent. For women alone the figure is 90 per cent. . . .

> Fingerprint records show that the number of men arrested for drunkenness in the first six months of 1941 increased 33.3% over the first six months of 1940. . . . Recent [National] Safety Council statistics reveal that drinkers were involved in one out of six accidents. Of the 12,500 pedestrians killed 2,000 (or 16%) had been drinking.

"FLOATING" THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

"War has given [the Drys] their biggest boost," according to the *Digest* writer, Vera Stagge. "The Dry lobby at Washington is not only evident for the first time since 1933, but it is decidedly vocal. Prohibitionist literature is having a wide circulation." The opposition:

> To counteract the Dry's propaganda, the Wets are broadcasting what a financial aid repeal has been to the Federal Treasury, hit by costs of national defense. In eight years liquor taxes have brought in $3,549,673,686.66. By the end of July, 1942, this will be swelled by another billion dollars—enough money to produce a small fleet consisting of 4 battleships, 5 cruisers, 20 destroyers, and 4 airplane carriers. . . . The tax ladder has been gradually scaled from $2 in '34 to the present rate of $4 per gallon, the high tax necessitated by the armament-building program. As a result of this step-up the Treasury expects to reap an additional $123,000,000 out of the distilled spirits industry and over ten million dollars in wine returns. The tax officials are plenty grateful for the liquor revenue which keeps rolling in.

"BROADLY SPEAKING"

> Broadly speaking, then, it all adds up to actual *cash revenue* versus human welfare, i.e. public safety, crime, sickness, divorce and all the rest of the evils that result directly or indirectly from intoxicating drinks. With this dynamic ammunition the Drys are putting up a powerful anti-liquor fight. They put prohibition over in the last war. Will they roll out the (whiskey) barrels during this one?

The "noble experiment," as President Hoover called prohibition, has been tried and has failed. It was an attempt to force self-control or self-discipline on others,—one of many experiments, before and since, in legislating in lieu of educating, but such tactics work only with tin soldiers and wooden puppets, and never with men of flesh and blood. "Prohibitions of all kinds serve only to exasperate the evil nature in men." A return to Prohibition would of a certainty aggravate, not alleviate the condition, and serve to encourage an additional form of that hypocrisy which is already the black mark of our culture.

Our Most Serious American Crisis?

Alcoholism has been too often described by medical authorities as a major, if not *the* major, public health problem in America, for the statement to need any supporting evidence. The immediate question is, how will the problem be solved? As the Research Council on Problems of Alcohol, set up by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said about four years ago in its preliminary announcement:

> It has become evident that nothing can be accomplished by the application of main force. If we are to find a way out it can only be through the development of a complete factual basis on which can be built some effective plan of action.

A complete factual basis would of necessity involve knowledge of the effects of alcohol on all the distinct and different functions of the human being, of which the purely physical are perhaps the least important, albeit the easiest to determine. Such a substantial body of facts is steadily being collected which may by its very volume force scientists—and others—to give to the *qualitative* aspects of the problem a degree of attention at least equal to that afforded the quantitative. The "factual basis" so far evolved was treated by Theosophy in "Alcoholism—A National Emergency" (xxii, 210).

More Intoxicant Information

In 1937, Dr. Thorne M. Carpenter, Boston chemist, announced (New York *Times,* Feb. 2, 1937) that alcohol is unique among our eats and drinks, and whether swallowed or *breathed* mixes rapidly with body tissues and fluids. No organ actually stores alcohol, it circulates in the blood, and "sleeping" or "working" it off is impossible: "Alcohol disappears in its own good time." Dr. Madeline R. Brown of the Boston City Hospital and the Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School, produced records showing that extra vitamins introduced into the hospital's diet gave no benefit to alcoholics. (New York *Herald Tribune,* April 27, 1941.) The New York *Times* of May 3 summarizes the findings of Dr. Clarence C. Lushbaugh of the University of Chicago, who holds that alcoholism increases susceptibility to disease:

> Dr. Lushbaugh's work disclosed that when rabbits had been stupefied with alcohol they died of pneumonia much earlier than did non-intoxicated animals. He also found that even immunized animals are more susceptible to infection when intoxicated. . . .

> These findings parallel clinical experience in the treatment of alcoholic patients who have contracted pneumonia. They indicate the need of more vigorous serum therapy in the treatment of pneumonia in alcoholic patients and a more frequent administration of antibody-containing serum than is necessary for the abstainer.

Significant as these physiological facts may be, they are less important than other effects of alcohol, on the brain, and on the psychic and mental natures. Medical science is beginning to investigate and emphasize these other reactions. Scientists are approaching the conviction, held by those who know of the seven-fold constitution of man, that what affects the body is, in a sense, simple, but what affects the mind is complex: the influence, on its way out of Man's nature, from the mind, must successively impress itself on all the mind's instruments, down to and including the physical.

A "BRAIN CHEMISTRY" DISEASE

Dr. Edward Spencer Cowles, director of the Body and Mind Foundation of the Park Avenue Hospital, New York City, once described chronic alcoholism as "a brain chemistry disease" (New York *Times,* Dec. 29, 1936). Even more radical was the opinion announced by Dr. Nolan D. C. Lewis, director of the New York State Psychiatric Institute, who reported that "alcohol ranks comparatively high as a cause of mental disorder or a precipitating agent of some mental disease." (*Science News Letter,* Jan. 4, 1941.) Among the mental diseases brought on by alcohol, Dr. Lewis names hallucinosis, hearing imaginary voices or "seeing" faces; delirium tremens, alcoholic paranoia (extreme suspicion and jealousy); the Korsakoff psychosis, in which "the patient's whole past may become a complete blank, so that he wakes each morning in a blank mental state"; chronic alcoholic deterioration, a case where "there is loss of memory, loss of efficiency and emotional stability and disintegration of the whole personality." Or, as a Sage put it 5,000 years ago, "he who attendeth to the inclinations of the senses" suffers, as a result, "loss of the memory, from loss of memory loss of discrimination, and from loss of discrimination loss of all!"

Consideration of the psychological effects of liquor may serve to connect alcoholism with its "blood brothers," insanity, hysteria and passion, whether of the individual, race or nation, which all derive from a common source—self-indulgence and selfish gratification.

Medical Students On "Life"

Of a nineteenth-century mystic it was said, "Much as he loved words, he was willing always that the deepest things in life should go unexpressed." At the other extreme is the man who finds his thoughts uncomfortable, not to say uncontrollable, unless they are reasonably well-catalogued. Somewhere in between is W. A. Pearson, Dean of the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia, who recently assigned his students the task of defining life, in order, he says, to stimulate original thinking. Seventy definitions selected from the replies appear in the *Hahnemannian Monthly* for last December.

The direct influence of medical training is naturally the greatest single factor in the definitions: Half the students identified life with chemical, physical or biological *processes* of "living" matter!

> Life is best described from the physiological standpoint. Since it is impossible to define it, we can at least describe it as having the props of excitability, conduction, and response which are the props of protoplasm and protoplasm is the basis of life.

This is the mechanistic outlook that life, force and energy are by-products arising "naturally," but inexplicably, out of the mere existence of matter or form. As another student put it: "Life is the aggregate of vital phenomena, a certain peculiar stimulated condition of organized matter."

But why "peculiar," when life is, presumably, an everyday occurrence? Who or what stimulates "organized" (!) matter, and how? Can man "condition" it? An example of the verbalization resorted to, when scientific concepts are indiscriminately mixed, is the following: "Life is the dynamic state of organic substance." And how beautifully simple—as well as meaningless—is the conclusion: "Life in all its complexity seems to be no more than one of innumerable properties of the compounds of carbon."

Life's Spiritual Editor

There is a tendency to revert to religious dogma when scientific dogma is inadequate, and some students postulated a spiritual power —"commonly known as God," as one put it—to which they delegated the "direction" of life processes:

> Life is the power by which an organism exists and performs its functions. It is that period of utility of the organism and is inherent in the organism only as long as metabolic processes can continue. It is initiated by one who is above the natural domain and has not as yet been synthesized by a mortal.

We leave to Mrs. Malaprop the question of why one who is above the natural domain should have to be synthesized by a mortal, now or ever, and pass on to a metaphor that deftly avoids all precipitous "whys" and curious "hows":

> Life is magazine-like. It presents an outer covering and an inner reality. Its pages are chapters, its pictures are events. Some are interesting, others are dull. It has an editor,—the Supreme Being and also a manager—the individual.

LIFE VS. DEATH

Maturer students, realizing the difficulty of "defining" life, attempted to say what it is not, thus invoking a subject of which they know still less—death:

> Life is metabolic activity opposing death.
>
> Life is a continuous set of phenomena preceding the state of cessation of phenomena.
>
> Life is a disease for which sleep is the palliative cure and death the radical cure.

Extreme escapists are two:

> Life is varied brevity before the inevitable domination of environment.
>
> Life is the spiritual preparation for death.

HUMAN LIFE

Man himself was remembered by some, and a sense of purposeful existence appears:

> Life, I believe, is a consequence or series of obligations. Life is only an existence unless you can justify your own reason for living by fulfilling the obligations that are yours upon birth. These, in short, are the reason for your existence in some way to benefit humanity. Therefore, life is some process wherein there occurs a series of obligations.

A philosophical recognition of intellectual and moral values:

> Life is the pursuit of happiness through a harmonious existence between our conscience and our actions.
>
> Life is a process of learning extended over a period of years in which an individual comes to realize the meager extent of his knowledge.
>
> Life is the integration of body and mind toward a common successful purpose.

Borrowed from Spencer:

> Life is a continual readjustment of external relations to internal relations.

God's Court Jester

Finally, a number of would-be aphorisms:

> Life is an electric potentiality resulting from physical and chemical activity.
>
> Life is a continuous stream of events influenced by man's hate and love and controlled by the laws of physics and chemistry and mingled with a few miracles.
>
> Life is that mysterious force that keeps God amused.
>
> Life is that stuff, made up of time, which is lent to us for the experiment of living.

In general, the answers show degrees of comprehension of the mystery of "life," more or less conditioned by the education of the individual. In some, the looseness of language points to shallow thinking; others, the result of insufficient thinking, are confused; still others substitute description for definition, information for knowledge. But a number are thoughtful, intelligent, and clear, and as such are evidence of the inherent ideas and intuitive perceptions that are the birthright of every man and that manifest on this plane when the channels between his real nature and his waking consciousness are opened. Perhaps the most truly philosophical position is that of the student who wrote:

> Life cannot be defined. Any possible definition of life given is but a definition of a phase of it.

Foolishness (?) With Figures

Mr. Ripley presents the following mathematical exercise:

	Roosevelt	Churchill	Mussolini	Hitler	Stalin
Born	1882	1874	1883	1889	1879
In Power	1933	1940	1922	1933	1924
Years	9	2	20	9	18
Age	60	68	59	53	63
Total	3884	3884	3884	3884	3884

Well, we would like to play numerology, too! Let us take the number 2; it represents the pairs of opposites; is the number of division and conflict, the first departure from unity; also the number of reproduction, hence of matter. Let us then divide the mystic 3884 by this deep-dyed digit and observe the result—this year!

But we may go still further; 5 is the number of leaders involved; 5 is the number of human principles *on the lower planes;* hence, the "sacred number" in Tantric and Hatha Yoga. Let us then multiply

3884 thereby. The significance of the extra zero? The symbol of infinity and finality—also of nullification. A fatal date multiplied by the *real* sacred number, *ten*.

DISTRIBUTION

Mr. William Ziff has written a book under title of *The Coming Battle of Germany,* which is somewhat of a misnomer, since the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from his work is that there will never be a "battle of Germany." (Unless, of course, Mr. Ziff's proposals for winning the war are adopted.) His figures on the world distribution of resources have far-reaching implications—some of which do not occur to the author himself. His principal theme is that the "have-not" nations, through their victories, are rapidly becoming the "haves." Since victory over the "have-nots" was previously possible only because of their lack of materials, the outlook for winning by the same means this time is very dismal. Mr. Ziff substantiates this by the following table:

PERCENTAGE OF AXIS CONTROL OF WORLD PRODUCTION

	1938	1942
Wool	3.4	12
Rubber	0	91.1
Flax	6.8	35.8
Cotton	0.8	2.6
Wood Pulp	11.4	32.9
Cement	33.7	51.6
Coal and Lignite	32	45.4
Crude Petroleum	0.4	6.7
Steel	24.7	43.1
Iron Ore	7.3	44.6
Manganese Ore	10	34.9
Nickel Ore	0	2.9
Copper Ore	6	9.1
Lead Ore	8.4	21.9
Zinc Ore	15	28.5
Tin Ore	9.4	73.2
Chrome Ore	2.7	16.9
Bauxite	25.5	65.8

WAR FOR "NECESSITIES"

Setting aside Mr. Ziff's military theme, we may examine some underlying implications of the facts he reports. The Axis nations, their *bona fide* allies and sympathizers, number some 300,000,000 people. The United Nations—or rather that portion of them who

once controlled the enormous wealth depicted by Mr. Ziff—number about 600,000,000. (China can hardly be counted as a "have," her own people having had as little control over their materials as the people of India.) In many respects, therefore, the mal-distribution in point of numbers was not great. In some respects the shoe was on the other foot. However, it was greatest in those materials necessary for military survival, particularly oil and some of the ores. The inescapable conclusion is that if the world had not been obsessed with the idea of fighting for necessities on the one hand, and of defending them by force on the other, "raw materials" would not have been a problem at all, far less a cause of war. It is thus evident that the theory of a number of our idealists that the whole world problem can be settled by giving all peoples "equal access" to raw materials has little standing. If military value were not attached to those materials, the problem would not exist; so long as that value does attach, it is insoluble.

The Karmic Root

"Materials" actually do lie at the base of the trouble, but in a far different way from that conceived by economists and strategists. Mr. Ziff characteristically omits mention of the third most numerous section of humanity—the 1,100,000,000 of "lesser breeds," in large part actual territorial possessors of all this wealth, who for generations have neither controlled nor profited from it. What of *these* "have-nots," now in a left-handed way coming into their own, and whose adherence to the respective causes of each side is being so vigorously sought by the contenders through various combinations of persuasion and force? The simple and brutal fact is that the "haves," who plundered yesterday's world and failed even to divide the loot satisfactorily among themselves, are now suffering from an attempted redivision—by a process so violent that it is rapidly destroying not only the stolen goods but those more legitimately owned as well. This is Karmic inevitability. In the inexorable workings of Nemesis, moving now with increasing tempo, the ultimate shift of power will necessarily be toward the vast, silent, brooding millions, or the *true* "deprived."

Stirring Giant

To huge masses of people, growing ever more discontented with their lot as learning spreads, ever more contemptuous of "modern civilization," the whole imbroglio may well appear as having little if any meaning other than mutual destruction. The United Nations

may be, as their idealists proclaim, fighting their own yesterdays as well as present greed, but the unrepresented masses have still to be persuaded. Only by fundamental reforms in international viewpoints, and obviously sincere mutual sacrifices, regardless of the outcome of the present war, can any of the "haves" avoid becoming in their turn, under the law of Karma, the "have-nots" of the future.

"Our Present Duty"

While so many are advocating that we "run abroad to souls we might possibly help," there are still a few to remind us of ever-present duties at home. Thus Dorothy Walworth, author of *Faith of Our Fathers,* appeals—"Look Homeward Too, Democracy!" in an article in the July *Reader's Digest:*

> Sometimes I wish the eagle of democracy would descend from her rarefied heights and perch for a while on the shoulders of common men and women. What wretched logic prompts us to fight for democracy in remote corners of the globe, then refuse to share it with a salesclerk? That's not the ideal which created this country. When our Republic rose, like a promise to mankind, its noblest buttress was the daring concept that differences in wealth and social position should not operate as barriers between man. . . . Too many of us deal in high-sounding platitudes about the "brotherhood of man," but exhibit an ugly caste consciousness by treating the waiter at the Dairy Lunch as though he belonged to another, inferior breed. . . .

Home-work For America

> The problem of putting democracy to work in our daily lives is not a simple one. But unless we contrive to do it, we risk losing the essence of the very thing we are struggling to defend in far-off corners of the globe. We shall not have true democracy until we are banded together in indivisible equality, no man unnoticed or crowded out, or less than his brother. The real triumph of democracy will not be recorded until the dignity of human beings is recognized, until every man jack American practices equality in his daily rubs against the coat sleeves of his fellows.

In other words, it is by establishing "a republic of brotherhood" in this land, that we become "brothers to all men and nations throughout the world."

"Scientific Antibodies"

Under this heading, Waldemar Kaempffert describes the researches of Drs. Pauling, Campbell, and Pressman of the California Institute of Technology. (New York *Times,* March 22.) According to these workers, the "antibodies" which doctors believe combat disease have been artificially produced in the laboratory "for the first time in history." Mr. Kaempffert accompanies his report with a brief statement of the conventional theory of infection and immunization:

> Germs and viruses are protein compounds. If instead of being absorbed in the form of food and altered to comply with the body's standard of normality, a protein is injected directly, the tissues realize the presence of something abnormal and resent it. That is what happens when the body is invaded by disease germs or viruses. Certain cells set about the task of removing the intruders or of neutralizing them. Hence they manufacture agents which can enter into chemical combination with the foreign protein and digest or otherwise act on it, so as to prevent damage.
>
> These foreign proteins are called antigens, and the antagonizing substances which the body produces are called antibodies. Hence an antigen is a protein which, when introduced into the tissues of a living body, gives rise to the production of an antibody.

Not So Simple

The deceptive simplicity of this account may be good journalism, but it is certainly not scientific. As a matter of fact, all theories of just how antibodies work to prevent disease are highly speculative and in many cases suffer from experimental contradictions. In some diseases, "though strong immunity develops, antibodies are not produced." This observation of Dr. L. Dienes, of Boston, is supported by clinical experience, which he summarizes as follows:

> . . . it is evident that the healing of natural diseases is not the direct consequence of the appearance of antibodies in the circulating blood. Serum therapy, in fact, through its very limitations furnishes evidence that antibodies are not ordinarily of decisive importance, . . . (*Boston Archives of Pathology,* March, 1936.)

Illustrating, Dr. Dienes relates that in treating pneumonia the "injected immune substance" serves only to localize the infection, "the actual termination of the disease being occasioned by an unknown process of natural recovery." With respect to tuberculosis he says that "antibodies are hardly ever produced," or only after

"artificial hyperimmunization." It may be noted that without any specific cure for tuberculosis, a remarkable decrease in the death rate from this disease has been brought about since 1900, entirely by sanitation and better living conditions. Yet, still fascinated by the experimental mania of the vivisectionists and bacteriologists, Mr. Kaempffert persists in hailing the synthetic production of antibodies as a great scientific discovery!

SCIENTIFIC SUPPOSING

The bodies of millions of human beings have been subjected to injections based on modern theories of immunization, despite the fact that, as scientists confess, "Not much is known about the manufacture of antibodies. It is *supposed* that they are produced by special cells found almost everywhere in the body." What of the experiments of Metalnikov, of Pasteur Institute, who showed that antibodies can be generated in the blood of animals without any injection—simply from an external stimulus on the principle of the conditioned reflex? Metalnikov called this "action at a distance" by the nervous system! (*Press Medicale,* Nov. 24, 1934.)

Mr. Kaempffert continues his lesson in immunological speculation:

> Any foreign protein can act as an antigen. Among the antigenic substances we must include not only microbes and toxins but also such innocent substances as egg white and the blood serum of an animal of another species. *The cells that produce antibodies are more discriminating than the most skilled chemist. They can distinguish between two proteins so similar that chemical analysis would regard them as identical.* It is now believed that each of the antigens of the bacteria or viruses gives rise to but one antibody.

"ADOLESCENT" IMMUNOLOGY

There is "progress" in the idea that the antigens "give rise" to corresponding antibodies. Writing of the depressing history of immunological theory, Dr. W. H. Manwaring of Stanford tells how representatives of the "adolescent science of immunology" once carried theological correspondences over into biological analysis:

> With mind polarized by subconscious ancestral beliefs in warring spiritual forces in the human body and in antagonistic morbidic vital humors, Pfeiffer assumed that the tissues of the first man were endowed with minute samples of specific antidotes against each and every morbidic agent the sons of Adam were destined to meet, or that a similar plurality of intracellular antimorbidic endowments has resulted from the miracle of evolution. (*Scientific Monthly,* April, 1930.)

Dark Breeds"

Now, however, due to the work of Manwaring and others, the mous "antibody" is regarded as an offspring of foreign protein d native plasm, although still pretty much of a physiologic mystery. ut whatever the scientific theory currently in vogue, there can be o doubt that the practice of injecting alien proteins into the human dy is gravely questionable. These biological "fifth columnists" mbine in hybrid forms with the elements of the human blood ream. Although the immediate effect seems in some instances to be neficial," hidden results of this violation of natural bodily econ- ny may bring disease and death in later years. The psychic factor disease is of still greater importance. Antigens derived from ani- als bear each their quota of lower animal effluvia, and this mis- genation at the cellular level is comparable to the spiritualist's sorption of cast-off psychic residues through commerce with me- ums and astral shells. (For a searching consideration of the Karma these practices, see THEOSOPHY XVIII, 155, and *The Laws of ealing,* published by Theosophy Company.)

hinese Science

The biologist, Joseph Needham, is one of the really eminent men f science whom theosophists respect and appreciate. From the .M.A. *Journal* for Oct. 25, 1941, we reprint the major portion of n article he wrote in collaboration with a Chinese scholar, Gwei jen Lu, "Chinese Contributions to Medical Science." With the id of such contributions to the history of science, westerners may me day be able to overcome the delusion that scientific knowledge egan with the rise of European culture:

> As the history of science comes more and more to include what happened during the long Chinese civilization, it will be recognized that the Chinese were ahead of the Europeans, often by several centuries, in advances which have revolutionized society. Three of the greatest discoveries were Chinese: the compass, gunpowder and printing. The mariner's compass originated in China before the ninth century A. D. and reached Europe by a slow diffusion lasting several centuries around the south Indian trade routes. Gunpowder appeared during the T'ang dynasty, *i.e.* about the eighth century A. D., and its use then was restricted to fireworks. Movable block printing originated in 932 A. D., so that Feng-Tao has some five hundred years seniority over Gutenberg.

. . . in pharmacology many valuable drugs were known. Some of these, ephedrine, for example, had no representative at all in Western medicine. Other drugs, such as stramonium, were common to both Chinese and Galenic pharmacopeias. The mineral remedies, such as arsenic, which the followers of Paracelsus had difficulty in introducing into Western medicine in the sixteenth century, were used by the Chinese in the thirteenth. So also was the iodine-containing seaweed and the anti-leprosy chaulmoogra oil. While the Chinese did not know of the cardiac-stimulating properties of the fox-glove, they obtained a digitalis-like drug from the skins of toads. As we now know, both these classes of active principles are members of the steroid group. Most surprising is the fact that a kind of vaccination was practiced as far back as the Sung dynasty in the eleventh century; the contents of smallpox pustules were inoculated into the nasal mucous membrance, an operation called "shu-miao," or planting drops of water.

DIETETIC EXPERTS

In one direction Chinese medical practice was extremely advanced: that of nutrition. Knowledge of dietary treatment of various diseases in China can be traced back as early as twelve centuries B. C. The "Record of Rites of the Chou Dynasty" (about 1100 B.C.) lists not only the Imperial Physician, the Imperial Surgeon and the Regius Professor of Medicine, but also an Imperial Dietitian. The Ching Kuei Yao Lueh of Chang Chi contains vivid accounts of deficiency diseases in their various stages and describes numerous diets. This knowledge was summarized in the fourteenth century A.D. by Hu Se-Hui, who occupied the post of Imperial Dietitian from 1314 to 1330 A.D. and wrote a book called "The Principles of Correct Diet."

Hu Se-Hui even distinguished between the two forms of beriberi, known today as the wet and the dry. He gave sixty-two different diets which would supply, as we know today, the missing vitamins of the B group. The motto of his book was "Food alone cures many diseases." In face of these facts, it is somewhat piquant that recognition of beriberi as of dietary origin is usually ascribed to Takaki in 1880 A.D., an admiral of the Japanese navy. Ancient dietetic knowledge is so deeply embedded in the people in China that no distinction is made between grocers' and apothecaries' shops. Beriberi was not common in China till modern times. Anciently rice was ground in every family on the day it was used; this preserved a thin fatty layer on the grain and a large portion of the embryo which contained sufficient B_1. More study should be devoted to the contributions which Chinese civilization has made to human knowledge.

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No. 76